Amendment dated July 23, 2004

Response to Office Action of April 6, 2004

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the non-Final Office Action mailed on April 6, 2004. The

932,1249

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claim 5 recites allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of canceled claim 5. Claims

1-4 remain pending in this application. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the

present application is respectfully requested.

In the Specification

The Applicant has amended the specification to correct minor informalities. Specifically,

the word "said" has been amended to recite "the" on page 2 of the specification. No new matter

has been added.

In the Abstract

In the Office Action, the Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format of the

abstract. Specifically, the Examiner states that the abstract includes legal phraseology.

The Applicant has amended the abstract to correct minor informalities including the word

"said" in line 3. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

6

932,1249

Appl. No. 10/684,933

Amendment dated July 23, 2004

Response to Office Action of April 6, 2004

Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 for failing to particularly claim

the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that "the armchair

user" lacks proper antecedent basis.

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite "an armchair user." Therefore, withdrawal

of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 were rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being

anticipated by Chou et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 5.

Accordingly, the Applicant asserts that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. By reason of

their dependency from independent claim 1, the Applicant asserts that claims 2-4 are also

patentable over the cited prior art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the anticipation

rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

7

932.1249

Appl. No. 10/684,933

Amendment dated July 23, 2004

Response to Office Action of April 6, 2004

Conclusion

In view of the above presented amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the

Examiner's objections and rejections have been overcome and should be removed. The

Applicant believes that the present application should now be in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the present application and claims 1-4 is respectfully requested.

The Applicant notes that there is no indication that the drawings are acceptable. The

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide indication that the drawings are

accepted by the Examiner in the next formal communication.

A petition for a one-month extension of time with the requisite fee is attached herewith.

In the event that any other extensions and/or fees are required for the entry of this Response, the

Patent and Trademark Office is specifically authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account

No. 50-0518 in the name of Steinberg & Raskin, P.C.

8

Dated July 8, 2004

Response to Office Action of Feb. 27, 2003

932.1249

Should any changes to the claims and/or specification be deemed necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to discuss the same.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, STEINBERG & RASKIN, P.C.

Dona C. Edwards

Reg. No. 42,507

Steinberg & Raskin, P.C. 1140 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 (212) 768–3800